

Social Environment and Community Character Technical Report

**State Highway 82 / Entrance to Aspen
Environmental Reevaluation**

February 20, 2007

**Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 3
and
Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division**

**Prepared by:
HDR Engineering, Inc.**

Contents

1.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3
1.1	Methodology	3
1.2	Regulatory Overview	3
1.3	Description of the Existing Condition.....	4
1.3.1	Population	4
1.3.2	Demographics	6
1.3.3	Services	7
1.3.4	Recreation	9
1.3.5	Land Use	15
1.3.6	Transportation Planning	18
1.3.7	Environmental Justice	18
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	18
2.1	Methodology	19
2.2	Compliance with Regulations	19
2.2.1	Applicable plans and policies.....	19
2.3	Preferred Alternative	20
2.3.1	Social Environment Impacts	21
3.0	MITIGATION MEASURES	24
4.0	SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION	25
5.0	AGENCY COORDINATION	29
6.0	REFERENCES	30
7.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	36
	APPENDIX A. FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATIONS	37
	APPENDIX B. CITY OF ASPEN ORDINANCES SINCE 1997 THAT ARE RELEVANT TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM	40
	APPENDIX C. TRANSPORTATION PLANS AND STUDIES SINCE 1997	42
	APPENDIX D. PLANS AND POLICIES SINCE 1997	44

Tables

Table 1-1. Population and population projections comparing FEIS (1997) data with currently available data 2000–2030.	5
Table 1-2. Pitkin County population groups 2000–2030.....	6
Table 1-3. Selected population characteristics 1990 and 2000 (percent).....	7
Table 1-4. Aspen School District Enrollment.....	7
Table 1-5. Aspen Valley Hospital patient admissions for 1996 and 2005.....	8
Table 1-6. Aspen Volunteer Fire Department (AVFD) details – 1997 and 2005	9
Table 1-7. Pitkin County ski resort data – 2005–2006	10
Table 1-8. Deer harvest and number of hunters – 1996 and 2005	11

Table 1-9. Elk harvest and number of hunters – 1996–2005	11
Table A–1. Federal and state regulations followed in development of the 1997 FEIS Social Environment section, changes in the regulations, and new regulations.	37
Table B-1. Infill Program implementation ordinances.	40

Figures

Figure 1a - Aspen Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Network 2006	13
Figure 1b - Aspen Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Network 2006.....	14
Figure 2 City of Aspen Zone District Map	17

1.0 Affected Environment

This report provides a reevaluation of the social environment presented in the 1997 State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

Topics covered include population, demographics, public services, recreation, land use, transportation planning, and environmental justice as they relate to the Preferred Alternative selected in the 1998 Record of Decision. It is possible to discuss public services, recreation, land use, and transportation facilities that exist or are planned for the project corridor because they can be located within a narrow physical boundary. Population, demographics and the wider community relationships that are related to these topics cannot be confined to a narrow physical boundary, however, and these must be presented and analyzed for the region. For example, although the project corridor lies entirely within Pitkin County, the study area for population also includes Garfield and Eagle Counties because commuters from those counties use State Highway 82.

1.1 Methodology

This technical report reevaluating the Entrance to Aspen FEIS Section IV.A, Social Environment, includes information assembled from many sources which are listed in the reference section. They include current plans, policy documents, and data from local government sponsored studies. Data in the FEIS were analyzed as they relate to the Preferred Alternative selected in the Record of Decision. More recent and/or current data on the same topics, as noted above, were assembled and compared to the FEIS data. Differences in the data and new trends were identified and reported.

1.2 Regulatory Overview

The subjects covered in this technical report are those necessary to meet the requirements of federal regulations pertaining to federally-funded (in whole or in part) transportation projects that avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse impacts. Table A-1 in Appendix A shows the federal regulations, executive orders, and state regulations upon which the 1997 FEIS was developed in regard to the social environment, and how the regulations were changed since 1997 (if they were), as well as any new regulations that pertain to population, demographics, services, recreation, land use, transportation planning, and environmental justice.

Many revisions have been made to City of Aspen Title 26 Land Use Regulations since 1997. Most of these are related to implementation of the *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan* and many will affect development along the State Highway 82 corridor. By adopting the *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan*, the City of Aspen and Pitkin County jointly approved Aspen's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in accordance with CRS 31-12-105 et. seq:

The UGB identifies the land surrounding Aspen as either appropriate for urban development (within the UGB) or inappropriate for urban development (outside the UGB). Land within the UGB is expected to become part of the City's urbanized area, at

some point, while outside the UGB should only be annexed as a method of preserving the nonurban character of the lands surrounding Aspen (Aspen/Pitkin 2000a).

The 2000 Aspen Area Community Plan, Barriers to Infill Development, a report commissioned by the City of Aspen in 2000 (Aspen 2002), made recommendations and identified action items related to growth management within the UGB. The report was published in January 2002. To implement the Infill Program several ordinances were adopted; these are described in Table B-1 in Appendix B. Other legislation of importance to the social environment of Aspen are described briefly below.

On March 28, 2006, the Aspen City Council approved an emergency ordinance that amended 18 sections of Title 26—the Land Use Code, “...in light of the potential rate and character of development activity and the negative impacts of such development activity on the health, peace, safety, and general well-being of the residents and visitors of Aspen...”¹ Highlights of this ordinance are in Appendix B.

Ordinance No. 19 (Series of 2006) was adopted, passed and approved on April 25, 2006. This emergency ordinance imposes a six-month temporary moratorium on the acceptance of any new land use application seeking a development order and on the issuance of certain building permits for property located in the following zone districts: R/MF, R.MFA, CC, C-1, S/C/I, NC, MU, L, CL, LO, and LP, except for essential public facilities.² Like Ordinance No. 12 (Series of 2006), this legislation is based on the rate and character of development activity, and further states that “recent land use applications seeking development orders in various City Zone Districts do not appear to be consistent with the goals and vision as expressed by the *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan*” and are having negative effects on the community. Among the negative effects cited are: the pace of construction is too fast to be absorbed and properly serviced, as well as being “deleterious” to the resort economy; Aspen is not achieving its affordable housing goals; the “infill code amendments” (listed above) are not having the desired effects; business serving local residents are experiencing negative impacts with the result that Aspen is losing “an essential character to the city’s retail economy; and construction traffic and activity have a negative impact on health, safety, and wellbeing” (City of Aspen 2006b).

1.3 Description of the Existing Condition

1.3.1 Population

In this section, population data and trends for Pitkin, Eagle, and Garfield Counties that were presented in the FEIS are compared with more recent data and trends. The FEIS notes that “at least three distinct population groups—Pitkin County residents, non-resident employees, and visitors—traverse State

¹ Ordinance No. 12 (Series of 2006) An emergency ordinance of the City Council of the City of Aspen, Colorado, approving amendments to Title 26—the Land Use Code of the City of Aspen Municipal Code, passed March 28, 2006 (Aspen 2006a).

² Ordinance No. 19 (Series of 2006) Imposing a six month temporary moratorium on the acceptance of any new land use application seeking a development order and on the Residential Multi-Family (R/MF), Residential/ Multi-Family (R/MFA) Commercial Core (CC), Commercial (C-1), Service/Commercial/Industrial (S/C/I), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Mixed Use (MU), Lodge (L), Commercial Lodge (CL), Lodge Overlay (LO), Lodge Preservation Overlay (LP) Zone districts of the City of Aspen, (Excepting therefrom land use applications for essential public facilities; and, declaring an emergency, passed April 25, 2006 (Aspen 2006b).

Highway 82” and are affected by the Entrance to Aspen. These population groups continue to be relevant to this project.

For residents, State Highway 82 is the only road out of Aspen in the winter. Minor differences between State of Colorado population projections for Pitkin County, the county’s own projections, and the 1990 U.S. Census used for the FEIS were caused by differences in collection and analysis methods and dates that the data were collected. Data used for comparison to those reported in the FEIS are from more recent sources and have not been adjusted.

The 1990 Census data showed a lower population for Pitkin County than that projected in the *1987 Aspen/Pitkin County Annual Growth, Population, and Housing Report*, which was attributed to a population shift from Aspen to communities farther down the valley. These trends have continued and are shown in Tables 1-1 and 1-2.

**Table 1-1
Population and Population Projections Comparing FEIS (1997) Data with Currently Available Data
2000–2030**

Jurisdiction	2000	2000	2010	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
	1997 FEIS	2000 Census ^g	1997 FEIS	Demo-graphic Forecasts ^f	1997 FEIS	Demo-graphic Forecasts ^f	West Glenwood Springs to Aspen CIS	Demo-graphic Forecasts ^f
Pitkin	14,800 ^b	14,872	16,700 ^b	17,169	17,700 ^b	21,410	25,204 ^e	26,148
Aspen	6,121 ^a	5,914	6,449 ^a	--	6,614 ^a	--	9,259 ^d	--
Snowmass Village	2,844 ^a	1,822	3,460 ^a	--	3,764 ^a	--	2,756 ^d	--
Unincorporated Aspen	4,471 ^a	--	5,392 ^a	--	5,851 ^a	--	6,340 ^d	--
Garfield	36,300 ^b	43,791	40,600 ^b	72,563	42,500 ^b	109,763	86,922 ^e	147,864
Eagle	27,700 ^b	41,659	31,500 ^b	57,000	33,100 ^b	73,400	77,226 ^c	88,000

^a FEIS data are from Table IV-2, a low growth scenario projection.

^b FEIS data are from Table IV-5, which reflect a trend in population shifts to less expensive communities down valley.

^c RFTA 2003, Table III-3

^d RFTA 2003, Table III-4

^e RFTA 2005, Table 2

^f Watershed Collaborative 2005

^g Sonoran 2005a
- Sonoran 2005b
- Sonoran 2005c
- Sonoran 2005d

Although the 1990s were high growth years for Pitkin, Eagle and Garfield Counties, the events of September 11, 2001, caused growth rates, development and investment to slow. While activity has remained high, it is not reflected as strongly because the base population has continued to increase (Watershed Collaborative 2005).

For Pitkin County, population growth rates based on draft projections reach 2.3 percent between 2010 and 2015 and then decline slowly. Similar to the conclusions about Pitkin County’s population in the FEIS, the assumption reported in *Demographic Forecasts: Eagle, Garfield, and Pitkin Counties 2005–2030, An Interim Report* (Watershed Collaborative 2005) is that population growth in the county will be mainly driven by increased use of second homes by retiring baby-boomers.

The annual population growth rate for Eagle County is forecasted to remain about 2.5 percent until approximately 2015 and then begin to decline. Although a 2.5 percent growth rate is considered strong, it is far below the 7 percent growth rates of the 1990s. This trend is also believed to be related to retirees and second-home residents. The local economy, land use, and job growth are expected to be dominated by this trend (Watershed Collaborative 2005).

The Garfield County population forecasts reflect expected growth in energy development jobs and a population of commuters to jobs in Eagle and Pitkin Counties (Watershed Collaborative 2005).

Although population growth in Pitkin and Eagle Counties is expected to be driven mainly by the second home/resort/tourism industry, and Garfield County’s by energy development, housing the workforce and the ability of the counties to provide affordable housing in an economic climate where property value expectations are high will be a challenge over the next decades. This issue will have an influence on the share of population growth distributed among the counties and communities in the region—especially where a county does not have the capacity to house its own labor force. The forecast rates of growth appear to be unrealistic to some communities as they study “build out” scenarios. Thus, the implication for the counties is that new residents will be accommodated in unincorporated places (Watershed Collaborative 2005).

The relationship among residents, visitors, and nonresidents is shown in Table 1-2.

**Table 1-2
Pitkin County Population Groups 2000–2030**

Group	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Total residents	17,258 ^a	19,488 ^a	20,598 ^a	21,410 ^b	23,811 ^b	26,148 ^b
Permanent	14,786 ^a	16,697 ^a	17,648 ^a			
Seasonal	2,472 ^a	2,790 ^a	2,950 ^a			
Nonresident employees	6,603 ^b	10,587 ^b	13,035 ^b	15,381 ^b	17,358 ^b	18,966 ^b
Visitors	33,853 ^a	38,226 ^a	40,408 ^a			

^a FEIS data are from Table IV-2, a low growth scenario projection.
^b Watershed Collaborative 2005, Appendix Table 1.

1.3.2 Demographics

Since the 1990 U.S. Census, the population of Hispanics (of any race) has grown more in the region than in the state—by almost 10 percent in Eagle County, 11 percent in Garfield County, and over 2 percent in Pitkin County (Sonoran 2005b, c, d). The state’s Hispanic population, in comparison, has grown by just over 4 percent (Sonoran 2003).

**Table 1-3
Selected Population Characteristics - 1990 and 2000 (percent)**

Characteristic	Eagle County		Garfield County		Pitkin County		Colorado	
	1990 (FEIS)	2000	1990 (FEIS)	2000	1990 (FEIS)	2000	1990 (FEIS)	2000
Caucasian	91.6	85.4	97.2	90.0	97.4	94.3	88.2	82.8
Hispanic origin	13.3	23.2	5.6	16.7	3.8	6.5	12.9	17.1
College degree	33.0	43.0	21.6	24.0	49.8	57.0	27.0	33.0
Median age	30.6	31.2	32.8	34.2	34.8	38.4	32.5	34.3
Sources: 2000 U.S. Census: - Sonoran 2005b , c, d - Sonoran 2003								

1.3.3 Services

1.3.3.1 Schools

Aspen public schools, administered by the Aspen School District, include Aspen Elementary School, Aspen Middle School, Aspen High School, and Aspen Community School (K–8). The elementary school, middle school, and high school are located at 119–235 High School Road, which is south of State Highway 82 and east of Maroon Creek Road. Aspen Community School is located in Woody Creek, which is between Aspen and Snowmass (Aspen School District 2005). Enrollment for each school is shown in Table 1-4.

**Table 1-4
Aspen School District Enrollment**

School	1996-97	2004/05
Aspen Elementary	--	493
Aspen Middle School	--	452
Aspen High School	--	505
Aspen Community School	--	116
Total	1,245	1,566
Source: Aspen School District Annual Report 2004-2005		

The district is actively promoting that students use transit, either the Roaring Fork Transit Authority (RFTA) or school buses to reach school, instead of relying on parents for transportation. They have instituted a punch card program, which has award incentives for using alternative modes to get to school (RFTA 2005a).

Colorado Mountain College, a public two-year institution, operates in 12 locations in western Colorado including in Aspen, Carbondale, and Glenwood Springs, all of which are along State Highway 82 (Colorado Mountain College 2006a).

The new Aspen Campus, the Morgridge Family Academic Center, opened in January 2001. The 34,000 square foot building includes classrooms, computer labs, "smart rooms," exhibition spaces and art studios. The Aspen Campus is a "community campus," primarily serving working adults who live nearby, offering some degree and certificate programs for full-time students (Colorado Mountain College 2006c). Total 2005 spring enrollment for the Aspen Campus was 1,293. The total 2005 spring enrollment at the Roaring Fork Campus (Glenwood Springs, Carbondale and Spring Valley) was 2,251 (Colorado Mountain College 2006a.).

1.3.3.2 Health care

The 49-bed Aspen Valley Hospital (unchanged from 1997) lists 61 physicians in its directory, up from the estimated 30 physicians practicing in the Aspen/Snowmass village area in 1997 (Aspen Valley Hospital 2006). Table 1-5 compares patient admissions for 1997 and 2005.

**Table 1-5
Aspen Valley Hospital Patient Admissions for 1996 and 2005**

Type of admission	Number of patients	
	1996	2005 ^a
Total inpatient admissions	1,765	1,775
Outpatient visits	33,264	30,927
Offsite clinic visits	N/A	11,151
Source: Ressler 2006.		

1.3.3.3 Ambulance

The Aspen Ambulance District operates from the Aspen Valley Hospital. The service responded to 949 calls in 2005, up from 827 calls in 1996. It made 666 transports in 2005, compared to 559 in 1996 (Walker 2006).

1.3.3.4 Law enforcement

The Pitkin County Sheriff's Department employed 38 officers in April 1977. The staff is now shown at 26, including four support staff (Pitkin County Sheriff 2006a, b, c). The Aspen Police Department lists one additional staff member. It now has 35 employees, 28 of whom are peace officers (City of Aspen Police Department 2006).

1.3.3.5 Fire protection

Since the 1997 FEIS was published, the Aspen Volunteer Fire Department (AVFD) responses have more than tripled from 232 total calls to 738. The major increase is in false alarms—502. The Fire Chief believes that this is a consequence of the high property values in the area—insurance companies require alarm systems and even a single smoke alarm will trigger a response. The AVFD is working on a system to filter out false alarms. AVFD has also experienced an increase in responses to hazardous conditions calls involving fuel or chemical spills, downed power lines, and so forth. These calls are thought to be possibly related to the increase in construction and development activities (Grob 2006).

AVFD continues to be the secondary emergency responder in support of the Aspen Valley Hospital. It is automatically called for CPR support and similar emergencies. A detailed comparison of AVFD's status in 1997 and in 2005/2006 is shown in Table 1-6.

**Table 1-6
Aspen Volunteer Fire Department (AVFD) Details – 1997 and 2005/2006**

Detail	1997 FEIS	2005/2006 Condition ^a
Station locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 420 East Hopkins in Aspen • Aspen/Pitkin County Airport • Entrance to Starwood • Stutsman-Gerbaz, Inc. garage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same • New station to open on Sage Way at the Airport Business Center (ABC) development in 2007 • Woody Creek • Aspen Village
Trucks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 pumpers • 1 ladder • 1 rescue vehicle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 3,000-gallon tender • 5 pumpers • 1 ladder • 1 rescue vehicle
Service area	70 square miles	87 square miles with same general boundaries as 1997
Staff and volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 paid fire chief • 3 paid staff • 40–45 volunteers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 paid fire chief • 4 paid staff • The Woody Creek station has a station keeper who is also a fire fighter/EMT • 50 volunteers
Calls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70 fire • 44 rescue • 232 total 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 fire (-66 percent) • 37 rescue • 71 hazard (-16 percent) • 97 service (good intent) • 502 false alarms • 738 total (+314 percent)
^a Grob 2006		

1.3.4 Recreation

1.3.4.1 Skiing

Downhill and cross country skiing remain primary attractions for residents and visitors to Aspen. Table 1-7 shows data for the 2005–2006-season.

**Table 1-7
Pitkin County Ski Resort Data – 2005–2006**

Ski area	Skier visits		Skiable acres	Number of trails	Number of lifts	Type of terrain (percent of area)			
						Easiest	More difficult	Most difficult	Expert
	1995–96	2005–06 ^b	2005–06						
Aspen Highlands	153,800	193,244	970	131	5 ^a	18 ^a	30 ^a	16	36
Aspen Mountain	322,300	324,468	673	76	8	0	48	26 ^a	26 ^a
Buttermilk	176,000	159,081	435	44 ^a	9	35	39	26	0
Snowmass	690,000	768,010	3,128	88	22	6 ^a	50	12 ^a	32

Notes: **Bold** numbers indicate that the data are unchanged from 1997 FEIS.
^a This amount is reduced from amount reported in the 1997 FEIS.
Sources:
Aspen Mountain 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d
^b Eagye 2006

Several Nordic trails were listed in the 1997 FEIS, but were not shown in the current GIS database. These trails operate only during the winter months. They have perpetual easements, but are only groomed from November 1 to April 1. In a few cases, Nordic trails are located on existing roads and trails.

1.3.4.2 Fishing

The Roaring Fork River, from above Aspen to Basalt is no longer classified as Wild Trout Water. It is no longer stocked from the Upper Woody Creek Bridge to Glenwood Springs (Hebein 2006).

1.3.4.3 Hunting

Tables 1-8 and 1-9 present the numbers of deer and elk harvested and the number of hunters in each unit for the 1996 and 2005 seasons. The three units include an area that is greater than the State Highway 82 corridor.

**Table 1-8
Deer Harvest and Number of Hunters – 1996 and 2005**

Unit	Bucks		Does		Fawns		Total harvest		Total hunters	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
43	737	476	317	221	15	18	1,069	715	3,244	2203
47	108	71	48	105	0	0	156	176	615	508
471	26	41	13	21	0	0	39	62	115	184

Note: Numbers are for all seasons and manner of take.
Source: Colorado Division of Wildlife 2005b

**Table 1-9
Elk Harvest and Number of Hunters – 1996–2005**

Unit	Bulls		Cows		Calves		Total harvest		Total hunters	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
43	631	332	428	365	55	43	1,114	740	4,307	3,733
47	191	105	110	165	11	5	315	275	1,066	1,285
471	34	73	18	30	2	7	54	60	166	295

Note: Numbers are for all seasons and manner of take.
Source: Colorado Division of Wildlife 2006a

The Division of Wildlife reported only one ram was harvested during the 2005 season from the area's bighorn sheep hunting units, compared to three rams and one ewe during the 1996 season (S13E and S13W) (Colorado Division of Wildlife 2006).

1.3.4.4 Rafting

The Colorado River Outfitters Association (Colorado River Outfitters Association 2002, Greiner 2001) reports 2,500 user days for the Upper Roaring Fork River in 2001, which was down from 5,000 and 4,500 user days in 1999 and 2000 respectively.

1.3.4.5 Pedestrian/bicycle trails

Hiking and bicycling remain popular activities and many trails of various surfaces are available to the public. Hiking and bicycling trails identified in the FEIS that parallel or cross State Highway 82 are shown on Figures 1a and 1b, and described below.

Owl Creek Trail is a 4.4-mile-long trail between Snowmass Village and Aspen that descends through the Owl Creek Valley to an underpass crossing of State Highway 82. The trail then joins the Aspen Airport Business Center (ABC) Trail (Aspen Ranger District, 2006). The portion of the trail that crosses State Highway 82 is in the City of Aspen, and was built as an underpass beneath the highway in 2001 as part of the widening of State Highway 82 (Weiss 2006, CDOT 2006c, D'Autrechy 2006a and 2006b, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails 2006).

James E Moore Trail (2 miles long) is used to reach the High School Trail from the ABC Trail and the Aspen Golf Course & Cross Country Center, with an underpass at the roundabout (Aspen Parks & Recreation 2006b).

Marolt Trail is used as an access route between the ABC Trail and the High School Trail (1.5 miles long). It also connects the West Hopkins Bikeway with Castle Creek Road, with overpasses at Maroon Creek Road and Castle Creek Road (Aspen Parks & Recreation 2006b).

Maroon Creek Trail (1.3 miles long) runs along Maroon Creek connecting the eastern end of the Government Trail to the ABC Trail (Aspen Parks & Recreation 2006b).

ABC Trail extends from Aspen to the Aspen Airport Business Center along the north side of State Highway 82 (2.5 miles long), with underpasses at Harmony Road and Truscott Drive, and is connected across State Highway 82 by the Owl Creek Trail, the Maroon Creek Trail, the James E. Moore Trail, and the Marolt Trail (Aspen Parks & Recreation 2006b, D'Autrechy 2006b).

The trails network has changed since the 1997 FEIS was published. Some trails have been modified due to planned construction along the State Highway 82 corridor. The following new trails have also been created as part of the trails network expansion (Weiss, 2006b):

Bergman Trail: This trail was constructed in the summer of 2005. It is an adjunct trail to the Marolt Trail providing additional access to the eastern side of the Marolt-Thomas Open Space. This trail crosses beneath State Highway 82 via an underpass.

Roundabout Trail: This trail was constructed in 2001 as part of the roundabout construction. It serves as a link between the ABC Trail, Marolt Trail, and the High School Bike Path. Pedestrian bridges were also built over Maroon Creek Road and Castle Creek Road as part of the roundabout construction.

Maroon Creek Picnic Trail: This trail was constructed in 2002.

Owl Creek Trail: Parts of this trail near State Highway 82 were realigned in 2001 as part of the Owl Creek Road realignment project.

Truscott Underpass: Located immediately west of the Truscott Drive/State Highway 82 intersection, this underpass was constructed under State Highway 82 in 2002.

High School Bike Path: This trail's connection to Highway 82 changed in 2001 when the roundabout was constructed. It now connects to the Roundabout Trail to gain access to State Highway 82 and other trails.

As discussed above, several **Nordic trails** were listed in the 1997 FEIS, but were not shown in the current GIS database. These trails operate only during the winter months. They have perpetual easements, but are only groomed from November 1–April 1. In a few cases, Nordic trails are located on existing roads and trails.

No other substantive changes have occurred to any of the resources identified in the FEIS.

Figure 1a - Aspen Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Network 2006

Figure 1b - Aspen Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Network 2006

1.3.4.6 *Additional activities:*

Two new recreation facilities have been added in the study area, but are not located in proximity to the Preferred Alternative corridor. The Aspen Recreation Center (ARC) was built in 2003 at 0861 Maroon Creek Road. It is operated by Aspen Parks & Recreation Department. The Rio Grande Skateboard Park was built in 2001 by the Aspen Parks & Recreation Department for use by skateboarders and roller bladers. Located at the eastern end of the Rio Grande Park, it has 13,000 square feet of skate terrain, including a small bowl, street skate, and half pipe (Aspen Parks & Recreation). Neither of these facilities is in or adjacent to the project corridor. In addition, the Aspen Golf Club was certified as an Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary.

No other substantive changes have occurred to any of the pedestrian/bicycle resources identified in the FEIS.

1.3.5 **Land Use**

As the corridor enters the Aspen City Limits, which starts east of the Aspen Airport Business Center, land use along the north/east side of State Highway 82 to the intersection of Owl Creek Road is classified as a Conservation (C) district. See Figure 2, which illustrates the City of Aspen Zone District Map (City of Aspen Community Development Department 2000). From the Owl Creek Road intersection to approximately Maroon Creek, the land is zoned Open Space (OS) with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district.³ East of the Open Space, and bordered by Stage Road and Stage Court, are two residential developments within a Park (P) district, all overlaid by PUD; one is Residential/Multifamily (R/MFA), and the other is Affordable Housing PUD (AH1-PUD). On the south side of State Highway 82 approximately between Tiehack Road and Maroon Creek are three areas; the land farthest west is designated P, followed by land designated AH (Affordable Housing), and then farthest east is land designated R/MF (Residential/Multi-Family) The P and AH districts have a PUD overlay, and the R/MF district has a Specially Planned Area (SPA) overlay.

Along the north side of State Highway 82 from approximately Maroon Creek to east of Cemetery Lane, the land is zoned as P with a PUD overlay and is occupied by the Aspen Golf Course. Land along the south side of the highway, from Maroon Creek to the roundabout at Maroon Creek Road, the land is unincorporated land has been designed by Pitkin County as Suburban Density Residential (R-30) and Agricultural/Forestry/Residential (AFR-2), and has scattered low density residential uses. From the roundabout to east of Cemetery Lane (Marolt-Thomas Open Space), the land is designated C, and from that point to Power Plant road, the land is zoned Low Density Residential (R-30). From Power Plant Road to Castle Creek, land on the north side of the highway is designated as Public (PUB) with a PUD overlay. This area includes the historic Castle Creek Power Plant, which is addressed in the Historic Resource section of this chapter.

³ An overlay district is used to encourage certain types of development within the existing zoning districts and contain provisions that are applicable in addition to those contained in the zoning law.

Land along the south side of State Highway 82 from the eastern side of the Marolt-Thomas Open Space to Castle Creek is designated R-15 (Moderate Density Residential), and has a PUD overlay. The Marolt-Thomas properties are also addressed as historic resources.

Residential uses are predominant from Castle Creek to 7th street. Land on the north side of State Highway 82 is zoned R-6 (Medium Density Residential); land on the south side is zoned as R-15 and R/MF with a PUD overlay.

Along 7th Street between Hallam Street and Main Street, land on the west is designated R/MF PUD and R-15, while land on the east is designated R-6 and Office (O), with the exception of the southeast corner of Main Street and 7th Street, where the zone is AH PUD SPA (Combined overlay).

The land immediately surrounding Main Street (State Highway 82) from 7th Street to Aspen Street is designated as O (changed from 1997 when it was Commercial Core—CC), with R-6 surrounding the O district. This O district is checkered with Lodge Preservation (LP) overlay zones⁴. The land south of Main Street between Garmisch Street and Aspen Street is designated as P (occupied by Paepcke Park). The land surrounding Main Street between Aspen Street and Monarch Street is designated as O (it was CC in 1997), with the exception of the southwest corner of Main Street and Monarch Street is zoned C-1. On Monarch Street from Main Street to Hyman Avenue is designated O on the west and CC on the east (formerly all CC). Along Monarch between Hyman and Durant Avenues, the surrounding land is designated as Lodging/Tourist Residential (L/TR) on the west (formerly CC) with P located on the east (Wagner Park). Heading eastward on Durant Avenue, land to the south is zoned L/TR west of Mill Avenue and P east of Mill. North of Durant Avenue, the land is designated P (Wagner Park) and PUB at Rubey Park. This is the terminus of the project.

The City of Aspen has two historic districts located within the FEIS project corridor, which remain as described in the FEIS (see Historic Resources Technical Report, State Highway 82/Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation, FHWA and CDOT, February, 2007b, for more information).

⁴ The Lodge Preservation Overlay (LP) zone district (26.710.320 of the City of Aspen Land Use Code) was instituted in 1999 “to provide for and protect small lodge uses on properties historically used for lodge accommodations, to permit redevelopment of these properties to accommodate lodge and affordable housing uses, to provide uses accessory and normally associated with lodge and affordable housing development, to encourage development which is compatible with the neighborhood and respective of the manner in which the property has historically operated, and to provide an incentive for upgrading existing lodges on-site or onto adjacent properties”.

Figure 2 City of Aspen Zone District Map

1.3.6 Transportation Planning

Transportation issues continue to be very important to the communities along State Highway 82. Roaring Fork Transportation Authority has been very active in plan development, especially concerning Roaring Fork Valley commuters. The following plans and reports have been developed since the 1997 FEIS, and will influence transportation facility and service development in the study area. Although these studies and reports consider State Highway 82 and the Entrance to Aspen, they would not change the impacts or intent of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative. Descriptions of the studies are located in Appendix C.

- *West Glenwood Springs to Aspen Corridor Investment Study*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority, May 2003. This plan includes the Preferred Alternative from the Record of Decision for the 1997 Entrance to Aspen FEIS (RFTA 2003).
- *Intermountain 2030 Regional Transportation Plan*, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, 2004. The draft FY2007–FY2009 STIP lists \$1.9 million for “Aspen State Highway 82” corridor investments (Felsburg 2004).
- *Local and Regional Travel Patterns Study*, April 2005—this study updates a similar study done in 1998 (RC Associates et al. 2005).
- *Title VI Compliance Report*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA), September 2005. This does not impact the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen project (RFTA 2005b).
- *Area-wide Job Access Transportation Plan for the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority for Colorado Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Administration, May 2005. This plan does not propose impacts to the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen projects (RFTA 2005a).

1.3.7 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations,” was signed on February 11, 1994. The FEIS states that within the project study corridor, “no minority (persons who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the United States who are African American, Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian or Alaskan Native) or low-income (persons whose median household income is below poverty guidelines) populations have been identified that would be disproportionately affected by this project” (EO 12898 1994). This statement remains valid.

2.0 Environmental Consequences

Environmental impacts of the Preferred Alternative selected in the 1998 ROD, including impacts from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, are described below.

2.1 Methodology

As described in the Affected Environment section, this technical report reevaluates information assembled from many sources, which are listed in the reference section. They include current plans, policy documents, and data from local government sponsored studies. Data in the FEIS were analyzed as they relate to the Preferred Alternative selected in the Record of Decision. More recent and/or current data on the same topics, as noted above, were assembled and compared to the FEIS data. Finally, the data were used to assess the impacts of the Preferred Alternative under current conditions.

2.2 Compliance with Regulations

2.2.1 Applicable plans and policies

Plans and policies that were in effect at the writing of the 1997 FEIS are listed in Appendix D.

2.2.1.1 Plans and policies since 1997

Since 1997, additional plans and studies have been developed which are listed below. Brief descriptions of the plans are located in Appendix D.

- *Interim Aspen Area Citizen Housing Plan*, July 1998. This plan does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Aspen/Pitkin 1998).
- *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan (AACP)*, February 2000. This plan advocates infill and increased density, but does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Aspen/Pitkin 2000a).
- *Aspen Area Community Plan Action Plan 2000–2005*. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does support it (Aspen/Pitkin 2000b).
- *City of Aspen Economic Benchmark Report* (Rural Planning Institute, 2001). It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but supports the need for it (Rural Planning Institute 2001).
- *Cemetery Lane Neighborhood Character Area Plan*, November 2001. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (City of Aspen Community Development Department 2001).
- *Infill Program Report*, January 2002. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does imply the need for it (City of Aspen Infill Advisory Committee 2002).
- *Annexation Plan City of Aspen*, September 2005. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (City of Aspen Community Development 2005b).
- *Demographic Forecasts, An Interim Report 2005–2030*, Fall 2005. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Watershed Collaborative 2005).

-
- *Draft Canary Action Plan*, City of Aspen Canary Initiative, 2006. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does support it by acknowledging the project's goal of maintaining State Highway 82 traffic volumes at 1993 levels, developing a TDM program, and proposed transit improvements (City of Aspen Community Development 2006c).
 - *Local and Regional Travel Patterns Study*, April 2005. The information helps gauge progress toward local and regional transportation goals and informs future investments in transportation infrastructure (RC Associates et al 2005).
 - *2030 Intermountain Regional Transportation Plan*, 2004. This plan was integrated into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (Felsburg 2004).

2.2.1.2 *Plans underway*

The Civic Master Plan, underway for the last five years, is nearing completion. Findings and recommendations were expected in December 2005 with a subsequent public process and City review (City of Aspen 2005a)

2.3 Preferred Alternative

Two components of the Preferred Alternative have been constructed since the publication of the FEIS and ROD: (1) Owl Creek Road and West Buttermilk Road have been relocated to create a new, signalized intersection with State Highway 82 near the Buttermilk Ski Area; and (2) the roundabout at the Maroon Creek Road intersection has been completed.

In addition, the Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement Project is currently under construction, scheduled for completion by spring of 2008. This project is being constructed as a bridge replacement without any increase in roadway capacity. However, it will accommodate the Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative in the future by removing the center median and re-striping for two general-purpose lanes and two exclusive bus lanes (see the Introduction to the Technical Report Volume for more detail).

The intersection of Truscott Drive and State Highway 82 was completed in 2001. While this intersection is not part of the Entrance to Aspen Project, its configuration accommodates the alignment for the east approach to the Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement Project.

A transportation easement across the Marolt-Thomas Open Space was conveyed from the City of Aspen to CDOT in August of 2002, as part of land exchange and mitigation agreements between CDOT and the City of Aspen and Pitkin County. (Refer to Appendix A and B in the 1998 Record of Decision for details of the open space conveyance agreements and mitigation commitments.)

2.3.1 Social Environment Impacts

2.3.1.1 Relocation and ROW Impacts

Relocation impacts identified by the 1997 FEIS would be the same—no relocations of businesses or residents would be required. One storage shed on the Marolt-Thomas property, currently used for storage of City of Aspen landscaping tools, would be moved elsewhere on the property prior to project construction. The appropriate site for the storage shed would be determined during final design. Based on existing social conditions in the study area, there is no evidence of any substantive, long-term adverse effect from the previous construction activities of the Preferred Alternative components.

2.3.1.1 Neighborhood Impacts

A total of twenty-six new residential units have been built within 100 feet of the project since 1998.

- Twelve multiple-family dwelling units, built in 2000, are located on the southeast corner of North 7th Street and West Main Street (719 West Main Street). These deed restricted units were sold to qualified individuals in 2001. As a result, twelve more households would be added to those identified as affected by the project by the 1997 FEIS. As with the 1997 FEIS, no environmental justice issues, no residential displacements, and relocations are anticipated (Christenson 2006a).
- Two new condominium buildings located within 100 feet of the project are part of the Bavarian Inn development. They are addressed 102–108 North 8th Street and 814–822 West Main Street, and were constructed in 2003. These deed-restricted buildings contain a total of 12 units (Christenson 2006b). No residential displacements or relocations are anticipated.
- Two other new residences are located within 100 feet of the project. These townhouses were built in 2004 and are located at 101 South 7th Street and 103 South 7th Street. They are not deed-restricted, and no relocations or displacements are anticipated.

As noted in the 1997 FEIS, the character of Main Street will change from residential to a transportation corridor. This impact remains the same.

Other neighborhood impacts identified by the 1997 FEIS would be the same. Based on existing social conditions in the study area, there is no evidence of any substantive, long-term adverse effect from the previous construction activities of the Preferred Alternative components.

2.3.1.1 Recreational Impacts

Aspen Trail System

The 1997 FEIS shows that seven trails would have a total of 6,380 feet of impacts from the Preferred Alternative (page V-17, table V-5):

- ABC Trail (4,690 feet)
- High School Bike Path (970 feet)
- Golf Course Nordic Trail (30 feet)

-
- Moore Nordic Trail (20 feet)
 - Maroon Creek Nordic Trail (100 feet) (see below)
 - Marolt Trail (110 feet)
 - Marolt Nordic Trail (460 feet)

Most of these impacts have already occurred and been mitigated, and additional trails have been constructed by CDOT and others in the study area. Trail additions, relocations, reconstruction and mitigation have been completed by CDOT for approximately 10,000 linear feet of trails in the study area to date, substantially more than the linear feet of impact from construction. These trail segments include the ABC trail from the Aspen Airport Business Center to Maroon Creek (relocated and extended as part of State Highway 82 improvements), the Owl Creek Trail (relocated as part of the Owl Creek Road realignment), the Roundabout Trail (built as part of the roundabout construction), and the Maroon Creek Trail (relocated and completed in 2006 as part of the Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement Project). All other requirements set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding between CDOT and the City of Aspen (July 27, 1998, ROD Appendix A) regarding the mitigation of trails impacts have been completed for the areas affected by construction to date.

The new Bergman Trail was constructed in the summer of 2005 and crosses beneath State Highway 82 via an underpass (see Figure 1b). This trail would remain open and unaffected during the majority of future construction associated with the Preferred Alternative. It would be temporarily closed when construction activities were taking place on State Highway 82 in the vicinity of the trail underpass (just east of the cut-and-cover tunnel). This closure will be a temporary occupancy, and a detour has been identified by the City of Aspen. See Section 4(f) Resources Technical Report for more information (FHWA and CDOT, February 2007c). This closure would have a negligible adverse effect on the area trail system in the study area. The trail would be incorporated into construction design, and be re-opened when construction in the immediate vicinity is completed.

Parks and Open Space

The FEIS evaluation determined that the Preferred Alternative would have no impact on the Bugsey Barnard Park, Paepcke Park, or Wagner Park. This evaluation remains valid.

Zoline Open Space: Impacts were identified in the FEIS to the Zoline Open Space along the edge of the parcel bordering State Highway 82 on the north side of the existing Maroon Creek Bridge. The Preferred Alternative takes 0.6 hectares (1.5 acres) of this open space. These impacts have not changed since the FEIS, and have occurred during the 2005–2006 construction of the new Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement Project north of the existing bridge.

Aspen City Golf Course/Plum Tree Playing Field: The 1998 ROD states that the Preferred Alternative would take approximately 0.68 hectares (1.7 acres) of these properties, including the Maroon Creek Basin

(ROD page 26 of 37).⁵ These impacts remain valid, and have occurred with the previous construction of the roundabout and the current construction of the new Maroon Creek Bridge.

Moore Property Open Space: The alignment of the Preferred Alternative selected in the ROD was shifted to the north to avoid the Moore Open Space, as described in the ROD. However, the transit station identified as part of the Preferred Alternative would take 0.6 hectares (1.4 acres) of the open space. There has been no conceptual change to this proposed transit station, so this impact remains valid. The area of take was minimized by eliminating parking at this proposed intermodal transfer station.

Marolt-Thomas Open Space: The Preferred Alternative crosses the Marolt-Thomas Open Space to eliminate the existing S-curves on State Highway 82. The FEIS states that the Preferred Alternative required 2.1 hectares (5.2 acres) of the open space lands. Of the existing State Highway 82 right-of-way, 0.4 hectare (1.0 acre) would be returned to open space. The cut and cover tunnel across the open space would return 0.6 hectare (1.5 acres) to open space. The total take for the Preferred Alternative is 1.1 hectares (2.7 acres). There have been no changes to the Preferred Alternative conceptual design or the open space configuration in the area of this crossing since the publication of the ROD, so these impacts remain valid.

As mitigation for open space impacts, CDOT has conveyed approximately 31 acres of open space by quitclaim deed to the City of Aspen and Pitkin County. This property (at the former Mills Ranch) is located at the intersection of Brush Creek Road and State Highway 82, as well as vacated right-of-way from the highway between Maroon Creek and 7th and Main Streets.

2.3.1.2 Impacts on Travel Patterns and Access

As described earlier, to begin implementing the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen project, two projects have already been undertaken:

- West Buttermilk Road and Owl Creek Road were relocated to a single intersection approximately 1,000 feet east of the former Owl Creek Road intersection. No further impact will occur from roadway construction in this area.
- A roundabout at the intersection of State Highway 82 and Maroon Creek Road has been built. Castle Creek Road was also connected to the roundabout to provide direct access to State Highway 82. No further impact will occur from roadway construction at Maroon Creek Road or Castle Creek Road.

Other impacts identified by the 1997 FEIS would be the same. Based on existing travel conditions in the study area, there is no evidence of any substantive, long-term adverse effect from the previous construction activities of the Preferred Alternative components. (See also Traffic Characteristics and

⁵ The FEIS states that the impact would be a total of 1.2 acres, consisting of 0.7 acre of the playing field and 0.5 acre of undeveloped golf course land (but presumably not including the Maroon Creek Basin (FEIS, page A-17). The ROD impact area of 1.7 acres is accepted in this reevaluation as correct, and is also referenced in the MOU between CDOT and the City of Aspen (July 27, 1998) as the total impact area.

Safety Technical Report, State Highway 82/Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation, FHWA and CDOT, February, 2007a.)

2.3.1.3 Parking Impacts

The FEIS reported that implementation of the LRT component of the Preferred Alternative would result in the removal of up to 252 parking spaces on Main Street, Monarch Street, and Durant Avenue, based on the south side alignment on Main Street. Because the exclusive bus lanes (allowed for in the Preferred Alternative selected in the ROD prior to light-rail transit development) will coincide with the location of the light rail (LRT) envelope assessed in the FEIS, impacts identified by the 1997 FEIS would be the same as those identified for the alignment described for the south side of Main Street. The implementation of bus lanes on Main Street would displace up to 169 parking spaces.

2.3.1.4 Public Safety Impacts

Impacts to public safety will be beneficial, as identified by the 1997 FEIS. The Preferred Alternative will provide for better emergency access (shoulders, medians, and a second emergency access across the existing Castle Creek Bridge), and will eliminate the S-curves on Hallam Street, 7th Street, and Main Street which will improve the safety of State Highway 82. Since publication of the FEIS, the accident rate in parts of the corridor has risen, largely due to congestion-related rear-end collisions. See Traffic Characteristics and Safety Technical Report for more information (FHWA and CDOT, February, 2007a).

2.3.1.5 Land Use Impacts

- The land immediately to the east of the Marolt-Thomas Property is now designated as R-30 (formerly R-15), but the impacts would be the same as described in the 1997 FEIS.
- Based on existing land use in the study area, there is no evidence of any substantive, long-term adverse effect to land use from the previous construction activities of the Preferred Alternative components.

Other impacts identified by the 1997 FEIS would be the same. Impacts are summarized in Section 4.0.

3.0 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures described in the 1997 FEIS have been implemented for components of the Preferred Alternative already constructed. These measures also would be implemented during construction of future components of the Preferred Alternative, and are adequate to protect the community in the project area. These measures may include planning and development commitments, right-of-way improvements, and agreements with resource or other agencies. Because the social conditions have not changed in a way that would create new impacts or impediments to project implementation, necessary mitigation is also essentially the same as that identified in the FEIS. No additional mitigation is needed based on current conditions and regulations. Specific mitigation measures outlined in the 1998 ROD are summarized in the next section.

4.0 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Impacts are summarized below in Table 4-1 as identified in both the FEIS and this Reevaluation. Mitigation measures listed in the table are those from the 1998 ROD, unless additional measures are noted as being required due to findings of the Reevaluation.

**Table 4-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Topic	FEIS Impact	Reevaluation Impact	Mitigation Measures
Relocation and ROW	<p>No residential or commercial displacements or relocations are anticipated for the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>One storage shed on the Marolt-Thomas property, currently used for storage of City of Aspen landscaping tools, would be moved elsewhere on the property prior to project construction. The appropriate site for the storage shed would be determined during final design.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The addition of the interim implementation of exclusive bus lanes would not change the impacts identified in the FEIS.</p>	<p>.The storage shed will be moved elsewhere on the property prior to construction.</p>
Recreation	<p>Encroachment on recreational and open space lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 Trails with total of 6,380 feet of impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ABC Trail (4,690 feet) - High School Bike Path (970 feet) - Golf Course Nordic Trail (30 feet) - Moore Nordic Trail (20 feet) - Maroon Creek Nordic Trail (100 feet) - Marolt Trail (110 feet) - Marolt Nordic Trail (460 feet) • Zoline Open Space – total take of 1.5 acres • Aspen Golf Course/Plum Tree Playing Field – total take of 1.7 acres • Moore Open Space – total take of 1.4 acres (impact identified in ROD, not FEIS) • Marolt-Thomas Open Space – total take of 5.2 acres (2.7 mitigated take) 	<p>Encroachment on recreational and open space lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 7 Trails will be or have been affected. (Precise linear feet reported in FEIS cannot be verified due to changes in the trail system and lack of mapped data from 1997). • Impacts reported for the ABC and Maroon Creek Trail have already occurred and the trails have been relocated and restored. • Temporary occupancy of the Bergman Trail (underpass) when construction is overhead and nearby; detour will be provided (see Section 4(f) Resources report for more detail). • No change to impacts to open space as identified in the ROD. Impacts have occurred to Zoline Open Space and Aspen Golf Course/Plum Tree. 	<p>CDOT will relocate, improve and/or replace all existing trail/bike path facilities and sidewalks impacted by the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Use of single-track LRT sections where possible to reduce the width of the cross section.</p> <p>Return of the abandoned portions of existing roadways to open space where possible.</p> <p>Use of cut-and-cover tunnel to preserve the continuity of the Marolt-Thomas Open Space.</p> <p>Approximately 10,000 linear feet of trails have been reconstructed, relocated and/or extended by CDOT since the 1998 ROD.</p> <p>Conveyance of approximately 31 acres of Brush Creek open space property has occurred.</p>

Topic	FEIS Impact	Reevaluation Impact	Mitigation Measures
Consistency with local plans	The FEIS states that the Preferred Alternative is completely consistent with local plans.	<p>Many new plans and ordinances implementing the plans have been adopted since 1998. The Preferred Alternative is still consistent with these new plans.</p> <p>The addition of the interim implementation of BRT would not change this consistency.</p>	<p>To acknowledge Pitkin county's goal of complementing the rural character of undeveloped land, or land developed at low densities, a narrow median with plantings (or left turn lanes) will be used wherever possible. Median design will be conducted to balance safety, aesthetics, and right-of-way width in the vicinity of open space and parklands.</p> <p>In keeping with Aspen's desire to slow traffic entering the city, a landscaped narrow median, narrow lanes on Main Street, and a cut-and-cover tunnel section of no less than 122 meters (400 feet) in length across the Marolt Open Space will be built.</p>
Parking	Removal of up to 252 parking places on Main Street, Monarch Street, and Durant Avenue to accommodate LRT (alignment on south side of Main Street). Adverse impacts would occur to some businesses along the downtown alignment.	<p>No change.</p> <p>For interim exclusive bus lanes, only Main Street parking would be affected, removing up to 169 spaces during any bus phase</p>	Provision of intercept parking lots and park and ride facilities in down-valley locations.

Topic	FEIS Impact	Reevaluation Impact	Mitigation Measures
Neighborhood	<p>32 Households within 30 meters (100 feet) of State Highway 82. Impacts may include changes in neighborhood cohesion, generation of new development, changing property values, and barrier effects of the transportation corridor.</p> <p>Change in character of Main Street from residential to transportation corridor.</p>	<p>New housing units: 26 additional households have been constructed within 30 meters (100 feet) of the Preferred Alternative corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 affordable units on Main Street that are within 100 feet of SH 82. • One 8-unit building on Main Street and one 4-unit building on 8th Street are within 100 feet of State Highway 82. Both buildings are deed restricted. • Two other new townhouses on South 7th Street are within 100 feet of State Highway 82. <p>Change in character of Main Street from residential to transportation corridor would be the same in type and extent, as would the potential neighborhood impacts.</p> <p>The addition of the interim implementation of exclusive bus lanes would not substantively change the neighborhood impacts reported in the FEIS.</p>	
Travel patterns and access	<p>Relocation of West Buttermilk Road and Owl Creek Road to a new signalized intersection to improve access to SH 82.</p> <p>Add a roundabout at SH 82 and Maroon Creek Road and Castle Creek Road to provide direct access to SH 82.</p> <p>Remove direct access to SH 82 from Cemetery Road, disconnecting the "S" curve.</p> <p>Add signals on Main Street at 7th, 5th, 3rd, and Garmisch Street intersections.</p> <p>Right in-out at 6th, 4th, 2nd, and 1st Streets.</p> <p>Convert Monarch and Aspen Streets into a one-way pair between Main Street and Durant Avenue: may impact business and park access.</p>	<p>West Buttermilk Road and Owl Creek Road were relocated to a single intersection approximately 1,000 feet east of the former Owl Creek Road intersection.</p> <p>A roundabout at the intersection of State Highway 82 and Maroon Creek Road has been built. Castle Creek Road was also connected to the roundabout to provide direct access to State Highway 82.</p> <p>The other impacts described in the FEIS would be the same. The addition of the interim exclusive bus lanes would not change the impacts.</p>	<p>During construction of the Preferred Alternative, CDOT will utilize appropriate traffic management techniques to minimize delays and inconvenience to the traveling public. This may be done by phased construction of the transportation improvements and by restricting the timing of construction activities and limiting traffic stoppages to off-peak hours.</p> <p>Whenever feasible, provisions will be included to minimize the effects on Roaring Fork Transit Agency [now Authority] (RFTA) buses.</p> <p>Construction delays will be limited to 20 to 25 minutes duration whenever possible.</p>

Topic	FEIS Impact	Reevaluation Impact	Mitigation Measures
	New travel patterns would be created with addition of LRT.		
Land use	No significant land use changes within the project corridor would occur.	No change	

5.0 Agency Coordination

The following entities were contacted for information included in this reevaluation:

- Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority
- Pitkin County Open Space and Recreation
- Aspen Volunteer Fire Department
- Pitkin County Sheriff's Office
- Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Aspen Valley Hospital
- Aspen Parks and Recreation

All agency and organizational contacts, as well as other data sources, are included in Section 6.0, References.

6.0 References

- Aspen/Pitkin County Community Development Department (Aspen/Pitkin), et al., 2000a. *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan*, February 28, 2000, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/aacp.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006
- _____, 2000b, *Aspen Area Community Plan Addendum A, Plan Action Plan: Work Program Priorities 2000–2005*, undated, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/aacp-actionplan.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006.
- _____, 1998. *Aspen Area Community Plan Addendum B, Interim Aspen Area Citizen Housing Plan*, July 1998, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/aacp-housingplan.pdf>, , accessed June 6, 2006.
- Aspen Mountain Stats and Facts, 2006a.
www.aspensnowmass.com/onmountain/statsfacts/statsfacts.cfm?area=Aspen%20Mountain, accessed June 22, 2006
- _____, 2006b. www.aspensnowmass.com/onmountain/statsfacts/statsfacts.cfm?area=Snowmass, accessed June 22, 2006
- _____, 2006c.
www.aspensnowmass.com/onmountain/statsfacts/statsfacts.cfm?area=Aspen%20Highlands, accessed June 22, 2006
- _____, 2006d. www.aspensnowmass.com/onmountain/statsfacts/statsfacts.cfm?area=Buttermilk, accessed June 22, 2006
- Aspen Parks & Recreation, 2006a. Skateboard Park,
<http://www.aspenrecreation.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=standardpage&mainid=242&yId=9&zId=1>, accessed June 20, 2006.
- _____, 2006b. Trails Guide,
<http://www.aspenrecreation.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=standardpage&mainid=25&yId=9&zId=2>, accessed June 22, 2006.
- Aspen Ranger District, 2006. U.S. Department of Agriculture, White River National Forest,
http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/whiteriver/rangerdistricts/aspen_sopris/trails/ROGSnowmassTrails.pdf, accessed June 22, 2006.
- Aspen/Pitkin Housing Authority, 2006. *Aspen/Pitkin County Employee Housing Guidelines*, Amended and Approved April 2006 for Pitkin County/City of Aspen,
[http://www.aspenhousingoffice.com/GUIDELINES_06/guide2006_04_28_06\(1\).pdf](http://www.aspenhousingoffice.com/GUIDELINES_06/guide2006_04_28_06(1).pdf), accessed July 6, 2006.
- Aspen School District, 2006. *Aspen School District 2004–2005 Annual Report*,
<http://aspenk12.net/Dist/DAC/reports.cfm>, accessed June 23, 2006.
- Aspen/Snowmass Nordic Council, 2006a. *Aspen/Snowmass Nordic Trail Map, Trail System: Aspen Cross-Country Center, Moore to Marolt*, <http://www.aspennordic.com/map/aspen.html>, accessed June 23, 2006
- _____, 2006b. *Aspen/Snowmass Nordic Trail Map, Maroon Creek Club Trails Aspen Access to Tiehack and Owl Creek Trail*, <http://www.aspennordic.com/map/maroon.html>, accessed June 23, 2006
- _____, 2006c. *Aspen/Snowmass Nordic Trail Map, High School Trail System*,
<http://www.aspennordic.com/map/school.html>, accessed June 23, 2006

-
- Eagye, Abigail, 2006. Snow falls, skier visits rise: Local mountains see 1.4 million customers, *Aspen Times*, June 16, 2006, www.aspentimes.com/apps/pbcs/dll/article?AID=/20060616/REREAUIB01/1061..., accessed June 26, 2006
- Aspen Valley Hospital, 2006. *Aspen Valley Hospital Physician Directory*, www.avhaspen.org/phsiciandirectory.html, accessed June 22, 2006.
- Christensen, Cindy, 2006a. Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority, Cindy Christensen, Operations Manager, personal communication—telephone calls from Terri Morrell, August 1, 2006.
- _____, 2006b. Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority, Cindy Christensen, Operations Manager, personal communication—telephone calls from Terri Morrell, October 27, 2006.
- City of Aspen, 2003a. Adopted Legislation, *No. 51 (Series of 2003) Approving amendments to the Resident Multi-Family Housing Replacement Program, Chapter 26.530*. January 2004, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Replacement.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2003b. *No. 53 (Series of 2003 Implementing a Revised Accessory Dwelling Units and Carriage House Program: 26.104.100—Definitions; 26.520—Accessory Dwelling Units and Carriage Houses*. November 2003, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/ADU-Carriage.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2003c. *No. 54 (Series of 2003) Approving amendments to the [multiple] chapters and sections of the City of Aspen Land Use Code...implementing a Transferable Development Rights Program...* November 2003, http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Historic_TDR%20Res_Zones.pdf, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2004a. *No. 27 (Series of 2004) Approving amendments to Section 26.710.090—Residential Multi-Family (RMF) Zone District and Section 26.710.100—Residential Multi-Family A (RMFA) Zone District*. July 2004, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/RMF%20and%20RMFA%20Zones.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2004b. *No. 28a (Series of 2004) Approving amendments to Section 26.104.100—Definitions and Section 26.710.140—Commercial Core (CC) Zone District*. August 2004, http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/CC_Zone.pdf, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2004c. *No. 28b (Series of 2004) Approving amendments to Section 26.710.150—Commercial (C-1) Zone District*. August 2004, http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/C1_Zone.pdf, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005a. *No. 5 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Section 26.412—Commercial Design Review, Section 26,575,030—Pedestrian Amenity, and Section 26,575.060—Utility/Trash/Recycle Service Area*, March 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Pedestrian%20Amenity.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005b. *No. 7 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Section 26.701.180—Mixed-Use (MU) Zone District*. March 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Mixed-Use%20Zone.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005c. *No. 9 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Land Use Code Sections 26.710.190—Lodge (L) Zone District, 26.701.200—Commercial Lodge (CL) Zone District, 26.710.310—Lodge Overlay (LO) Zone District, 26.104.320—Lodge Preservation Overlay (LP) Zone District, and 26.104.100—Definition of “Hotel (AKA) Lodge”*. May 2005, http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/lodging_ordinance.pdf, accessed June 26, 2006.

-
- _____, 2005d. *No. 12 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Section 26.710.710—Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zone District*, March 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Neighborhood%20Comm.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005e. *No. 17 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Section 26.515—Off-Street Parking and Section 26.104.100—Definitions*. March 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/Off-Street%20Parking.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005f. *No. 21 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Chapter 26.470—Growth Management Quota System*, May 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/gmqs.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005g. *No. 22 (Series of 2005) Approving amendments to Section 26.710.160—Service/Commercial/Industrial (SCI) Zone District*. May 2005, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/scizone.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2006a. *Ordinance No. 12 (Series of 2006) An emergency ordinance of the City Council of the City of Aspen, Colorado approving amendments to Title 26—the Land Use Code of the City of Aspen Municipal Code*. March 28, 2006, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/emergencyordinance.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2006b. *Ordinance No. 19 (Series of 2006) Imposing a six month temporary moratorium on the acceptance of any new land use application seeking a development order and on the Residential Multi-Family (R/MF), Residential/ Multi-Family (R/MFA) Commercial Core (CC), Commercial (C-1), Service/Commercial/Industrial (S/C/I), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Mixed Use (MU), Lodge (L), Commercial Lodge (CL), Lodge Overlay (LO), Lodge Preservation Overlay (LP) Zone districts of the City of Aspen, (Excepting therefrom land use applications for essential public facilities; and, declaring an emergency*, April 25, 2006, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/moratoriumsummary.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- City of Aspen, 2006c. *Draft Canary Action Plan, City of Aspen Canary Initiative*, Environmental Health Department City of Aspen, 2006 (pages 3, 12, 13, and 22).
- City of Aspen Community Development Department, 2001. *City of Aspen Cemetery Lane Neighborhood Plan*, November 26, 2001, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/cemlandnp.pdf>, accessed June 23, 2006.
- _____, 2004. *City of Aspen Zone District Map*, February 24, 2004, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/depts/46/images/cityzone.pdf>, accessed June 10, 2006.
- _____, 2005 *Annexation Plan City of Aspen*, September 2005 (pages 3, 6, 7, 17 and 18).
- City of Aspen Parks, Recreation Center, 2006. www.aspenrecreation.com, accessed June 20, 2006.
- City of Aspen, Aspen Police Department, 2006. Divisions, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/depts/53/divisions.cfm>
- City of Aspen and Pitkin County Community Development Department, 2005. *The Civic Master Plan*, City of Aspen and Pitkin County Community Development Newsletter Winter 2005, (http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/news2005_winter.pdf), accessed June 28, 2006
- City of Aspen Infill Advisory Group and Aspen Community Development Department, 2000. *The 2000 Aspen Area Community Plan, Barriers to Infill Development*, (a report commissioned by the City of Aspen in 2000) <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/SectionOne.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.

-
- Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), 1995. *State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Draft Environmental Impact Statement Technical Reports*, Project STA 082A-008, August 1995. [Draft Environmental Impact Statement State Highway 82: Basalt To Aspen, Social Profile – Project Study Area and Social Impact and Relocation Analysis, Environmental Research Consultants, Ltd., July 1988.]
- _____, 1997. *State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Final Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation Volume 1 (FEIS)*, Project STA 082A-008, August 1997.
- _____, 1998. *State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision (ROD)*, Project STA 082A-008, August 1998.
- _____, 2005. *Colorado Department of Transportation Environmental Stewardship Guide*, May 2005, <http://www.dot.state.co.us/US50E/pdf/ESGuide5-12-05e-book.pdf>, accessed June 28, 2006.
- _____, 2006a. *Colorado Department of Transportation FY2007–FY2009 STIP for Final Review* as approved May 18, 2006 by the Transportation Commission, <http://www.dot.state.co.us/Budget/FINAL%20TC%20STIP%20packet%205-22-06.pdf>, accessed June 30, 2006.
- _____, 2006b. Colorado Department of Transportation News Release Archives, State Highway 82 Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement, Work on State Highway 82 Maroon Creek Bridge Progresses, April 7, 2006, www.dot.state.co.us/MaroonCreek/releases.cfm, accessed June 22, 2006.
- _____, 2006c. Project Description, State Highway 82, AABC Between Aspen Airport Business Center & Buttermilk <http://www.dot.state.co.us/SH82/aabc.html>, accessed August 1, 2006.
- Colorado Division of Wildlife, Big Game, 2005a. Elk harvest, hunters, and recreation days for all manners of take, http://wildlife.state.co.us/NR/ronlyres/842777FC-60CC-4DF2-8EE2-0254046B446B/0/DEER_06HuntRecap.pdf, accessed June 22, 2006
- _____, 2005b. Big Game, 2005 Deer harvest, hunters, and recreation days for all manners of take, http://wildlife.state.co.us/NR/ronlyres/CECF8326-9E18-4928-A06D-E3AC696490D7/0/ELK_06HuntRecap.pdf, accessed June 22, 2006
- _____, 2006. Big Game, Limited License Reporting, Hunting Recap Report-2006 Sheep, Active Table CORIS, http://wildlife.state.co.us/NR/ronlyres/5BB6DB77-6703-4BAB-A720-D08177E41B17/0/SHEEP_06HuntRecap.pdf, accessed June 22, 2006
- Colorado Mountain College, 2005a. Colorado Mountain College E-News, 2004/05 Annual Report of Student Demographics, May, 2006, attachments 0405AnnualrptsiteSheets2.pdf, (<http://enews.coloradomtn.edu/index.cfm?method=c.artDetail&artID=1394>. accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____, 2005b. Facts & Stats, (http://www.coloradomtn.edu/campus_esp/home.shtml), accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____. 2006. Catalogue 2006-2007 <http://catalog.coloradomtn.edu/index.cfm?method=c.MainCatalog&cid=50&csid=239> accessed August 16, 2006.
- Colorado River Outfitters Association, 2001 (www.croa.org/2001-rafting-report2.htm, accessed June 22, 2006
- D’Autrechy, Barb, 2006a. Barb D’Autrechy, Program Specialist, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails. Personal communication, telephone call from Terri Morrell, August 1, 2006.
- _____, 2006b Program Specialist, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails. Personal communication, letter from Barb D’Autrechy with map attachment, to Dan Miller and Terri Morrell, July 27, 2006.

-
- Department of Energy (DOE), 1969. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94-52, July 3, 1975, Pub. L. 94-83, August 9, 1975, and Pub. L. 97-258, § 4(b), Sept. 13, 1982), <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/eo/eo12898.pdf>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1994. Executive Order 12898 Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 11, 1994, <http://www.fs.fed.us/land/envjust.html>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 1958. Title 23 - Highways Section 109 – Standards (h), <http://www.washingtonwatchdog.org/documents/usc/ttl23/index.html>, accessed June 28, 2006.
- _____, 1966. Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) FHWA49 USC 303, <http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/pd5sec4f.asp>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____, 1971. Uniform Relocation & Real Property Acquisition Act, FHWA, 42 USC 4601 as amended, <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/realestate/act.htm#Title%20I>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____, 1991. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. <http://ntl.bts.gov/DOCS/ste.html>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____, 1998. Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tea21/>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- _____, 2005. Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/legis.htm>, accessed June 27, 2006.
- FHWA and CDOT. 2007a. Traffic Characteristics and Safety Technical Report, State Highway 82/Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation. February 2007.
- ____ and CDOT. 2007b. Historic Resources Technical Report, State Highway 82/Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation. February 2007.
- ____ and CDOT. 2007c. Section 4(f) Resources Technical Report, State Highway 82/Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation. February 2007.
- Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, 2004. For the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, *2030 Intermountain Regional Transportation Plan*, , October 2004, http://www.dot.state.co.us/StatewidePlanning/PlansStudies/files_final2030update_jdc/2030%20Regional%20Plans_Transit%20Elements/Intermountain%202030%20RTP.pdf, accessed June, 27, 2006.
- Greiner, Joe and Werner, Jody, 2001. Compiled for Colorado River Outfitters Association, Individual River Commercial Rafting Statistics-3 yr range, Wilderness Aware Rafting, www.croa.org/2001-rafting-report2.htm
- Grob, Darryl, 2006. Darryl Grob, Fire Chief Aspen Volunteer Fire Department, personal communication from Terri Morrell regarding station locations, number of staff and fire fighters, and types/numbers of fire fighting equipment, June 29, 2006.
- Hebein, Sherman. 2006. Sherman Hebein, Colorado Division of Wildlife. Senior Fisheries Biologist. Personal Communication with Kristine MacKinnon, Current status of game fish species and habitat designation in the project area June 30, 2006.
- Pitkin County Sheriff's Office, 2006a. Patrol Operations, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/depts/28/patrol.cfm>, accessed June 22, 2006.
- _____, 2006b. Patrol Operations, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/depts/28/investigations.cfm>, accessed June 22, 2006.

-
- _____, 2006c. Patrol Operations, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/depts/employees.cfm?DeptID=28>), accessed June 22, 2006.
- Pitkin County Open Space and Trails, 2006. Open Space and Trails Map, http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/21/ost_map2004low.pdf, accessed June 20, 2006.
- RC Associates et al, 2005. RC Associates, Charlier Associates, and Healthy Mountain Communities, *Local and Regional Travel Patterns Study*, April 2005 (Pages 3, 1314, 34, 69–71, 81).
- Ressler, David, 2006. David Ressler, Aspen Valley Hospital, CEO/Administrator, personal communication, email June 30, 2006,, with Terri Morrell regarding current patient data.
- Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA), 2005a. For Colorado Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Administration, *Area-wide Job Access Transportation Plan for the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys*, May 20, 2005 (pages 1–7, 13–15, 19, and 21).
- _____, 2005b. *Title VI Compliance Report*, September 2005 (Section 1).
- _____, 2003. With Otak, Inc., 2003. *West Glenwood Springs to Aspen CIS*, May 2003.
- Rural Planning Institute, 2001. *City of Aspen Economic Benchmark Report*, <http://www.aspenpitkin.com/pdfs/depts/41/economicbenchmark.pdf>, accessed June 20, 2006.
- Snowmass Club, 2006. www.snowmassclub.com/golf-tennis-club.html, accessed June 23, 2006.
- Sonoran Institute et al, 2003. Healthy Mountain Communities, for U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, *Population, Employment, Poverty and Demographics for the 2000 U.S. Census, Colorado*, July 29, 2003, <http://www.hmcnews.org/communityindicators/colorado7-29-03.pdf>, accessed June 26, 2006.
- _____, 2005a. *A SocioEconomic Profile, Aspen City, Colorado, Economic Profile System Community (EPSC)*, October 25, 2005, <http://www.hmcnews.org/communityindicators/Aspen10-25-05.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006.
- _____, 2005b. *A SocioEconomic Profile, Pitkin County, Colorado, Economic Profile System Community (EPSC)*, September 26, 2005, <http://www.hmcnews.org/communityindicators/Pitkin-9-26-2005.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006.
- _____, 2005c. *A SocioEconomic Profile, Eagle County, Colorado, Economic Profile System Community (EPSC)*, September 26, 2005, <http://www.hmcnews.org/communityindicators/Eagle-9-26-2005.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006.
- _____, 2005d. *A SocioEconomic Profile, Garfield County, Colorado, Economic Profile System Community (EPSC)*, September 26, 2005, <http://www.hmcnews.org/communityindicators/Garfield-9-26-2005.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2006.
- The Watershed Collaborative, 2005. *Demographic Forecasts: Eagle, Garfield, and Pitkin Counties 2005–2030, An Interim Report*. The Watershed Collaborative Growth Scenarios Project, 2005.
- U. S. Department of Justice, 2000. Executive Order 13166 Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency, August 11, 2000, <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/Pubs/eolep.htm>, accessed June 28, 2006.
- Weiss, Austin, 2006a. Austin Weiss, Trails Coordinator, City of Aspen Parks and Recreation, personal communication, telephone call from Terri Morrell, August 1, 2006.
- Weiss, Austin, 2006b. Austin Weiss, Trails Coordinator, City of Aspen Parks and Recreation, personal communication, telephone call from Kristine MacKinnon, September 12, 2006.

7.0 List of Preparers

Terri A. Morrell, AICP, Senior Planner, HDR Engineering, Inc.

Kristen Maines, Environmental Planner, HDR Engineering, Inc. (QC)

Appendix A. Federal and state regulations

Table A-1
Federal and state regulations followed in development of the 1997 FEIS Social Environment section, changes in the regulations, and new regulations.

Applicable regulation to Social Environment assessment	Description	Changes if any	Relationship to project
<p>The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA) (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94-52, July 3, 1975, Pub. L. 94-83, August 9, 1975, and Pub. L. 97-258, § 4(b), Sept. 13, 1982) <i>(DOE 1969)</i></p>	<p>The purposes of this Act are to prevent or eliminate damage to the environment, protect the health and welfare of people, to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the region</p>		<p>All projects involving the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) must follow NEPA regulations. Procedures and guidance are set by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).</p>
<p>1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) <i>(FHWA 1991)</i></p>	<p>This landmark provided policy guidance and funding for highway, transit, and safety programs, and authorizes Federal transportation programs in these areas for fiscal years 1992–1997. Through ISTEA, FHWA provided a strategic investment framework, created programs, such as the Surface Transportation Program, that provided flexibility to state and local officials, and helped assure that transportation investments would meet the unique needs of their communities. ISTEA's authority expired in October 1997.</p>	<p>This program was reauthorized as Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) (see below).</p>	<p>An important step in coordinating and funding local multimodal projects, and funds for Transportation Enhancement activities, such as landscaping and beautification, rehabilitation—important to this project.</p>

Applicable regulation to Social Environment assessment	Description	Changes if any	Relationship to project
Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) <i>(FHWA 1998)</i>	The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century was enacted June 9, 1998. TEA-21 authorized the federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the period 1998-2003. The TEA-21 Restoration Act, enacted July 22, 1998, provided technical corrections to the original law.	This program continued ISTEA in 1998 and was reauthorized as Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005 (see below)	Continued ISTEA's innovative policies.
Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) <i>(FHWA 2005)</i>	SAFETEA-LU, signed on August 10, 2005, by President Bush, authorizes the federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 5-year period from 2005 to 2009	New in 2005.	This legislation addresses the challenges of the proposed project: improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment.
Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice <i>(EPA 1994)</i>	Requires that federal agencies ensure that there are no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations for their agency actions.		Evaluation of minority and low income populations must be addressed to ensure compliance.
Uniform Relocation & Real Property Acquisition Act, FHWA, 42 USC 4601 <i>(FHWA 1971)</i>	Requires agencies that must use private property to acquire it at fair market value and assist in any necessary relocation of residences or business.		The project corridor is adjacent to residences and businesses.
Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) FHWA49 USC 303 <i>(FHWA 1966)</i>	Forbids Dept. of Transportation agencies' use of public parks, recreation areas, wildlife/waterfowl refuges, or historic sites unless there is no "prudent and feasible" alternative and the agency employs "all possible planning to minimize harm."		Parks and historic sites exist near the project.

Applicable regulation to Social Environment assessment	Description	Changes if any	Relationship to project
<p>Executive Order 13166 Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (August 11, 2000) <i>(U. S. Department of Justice 2000)</i></p>	<p>to improve access to federally conducted and federally assisted programs and activities for persons who, as a result of national origin, are limited in their English proficiency (LEP).</p>	<p>New in 2000</p>	<p>As the population of persons with Hispanic origins (for example) continues to increase in the project area, eligible persons who are not proficient in the English language must be afforded meaningful opportunities to access federally funded programs and activities.</p>
<p>Title 23 - Highways Section 109 – Standards (h) <i>(FHWA 1958)</i></p>	<p>The purpose of this regulation is to assure that possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project have been fully considered and that the final decisions are made in the best overall public interest.</p>		<p>This covers the important topics of air, noise, water pollution; man-made and natural resources, aesthetic values, community cohesion, public facilities and services; adverse employment effects, and tax and property values losses; displacement of people, businesses and farms; and disruption of desirable community and regional growth.</p>

Appendix B. City of Aspen ordinances since 1997 that are relevant to Social Environment Technical Report

**Table B-1
Infill Program Implementation Ordinances**

Ordinance	Title	Date
No. 51 (Series of 2003)	Approving amendments to the Resident Multi-Family Housing Replacement Program, Chapter 26.530. (<i>City of Aspen 2003a</i>)	January 2004
No. 53 (Series of 2003)	Implementing a Revised Accessory Dwelling Units and Carriage House Program: 26.104.100— Definitions; 26.520—Accessory Dwelling Units and Carriage Houses. . (<i>City of Aspen 2003b</i>)	November 2003
No. 54 (Series of 2003)	Approving amendments to the [multiple] chapters and sections of the City of Aspen Land Use Code...implementing a Transferable Development Rights Program.... (<i>City of Aspen 2003c</i>)	November 2003
No. 27 (Series of 2004)	Approving amendments to Section 26.710.090—Residential Multi-Family (RMF) Zone District and Section 26.710.100—Residential Multi-Family A (RMFA) Zone District. (<i>City of Aspen 2004a</i>)	July 2004
No. 28a (Series of 2004)	Approving amendments to Section 26.104.100—Definitions and Section 26.710.140—Commercial Core (CC) Zone District. (<i>City of Aspen 2004b</i>)	August 2004
No. 28b (Series of 2004)	Approving amendments to Section 26.710.150—Commercial (C-1) Zone District. (<i>City of Aspen 2004c</i>)	August 2004
No. 5 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Section 26.412—Commercial Design Review, Section 26,575,030—Pedestrian Amenity, and Section 26,575.060—Utility/Trash/Recycle Service Area. (<i>City of Aspen 2005a</i>)	March 2005
No. 7 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Section 26.701.180—Mixed-Use (MU) Zone District. . (<i>City of Aspen 2005b</i>)	March 2005
No. 9 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Land Use Code Sections 26.710.190—Lodge (L) Zone District, 26.701.200—Commercial Lodge (CL) Zone District, 26.710.310—Lodge Overlay (LO) Zone District, 26.104.320—Lodge Preservation Overlay (LP) Zone District, and 26.104.100—Definition of “Hotel (AKA) Lodge”. (<i>City of Aspen 2005c</i>)	May 2005
No. 12 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Section 26.710.710—Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zone District. (<i>City of Aspen 2005d</i>)	March 2005
No. 17 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Section 26.515—Off-Street Parking and Section 26.104.100—Definitions. (<i>City of Aspen 2005e</i>)	March 2005
No. 21 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Chapter 26.470—Growth Management Quota System. (<i>City of Aspen 2005f</i>)	May 2005
No. 22 (Series of 2005)	Approving amendments to Section 26.710.160—Service/Commercial/Industrial (SCI) Zone District. (<i>City of Aspen 2005g</i>)	May 2005

On March 28, 2006, the Aspen City Council approved an emergency ordinance that amended 18 sections of Title 26—the land Use Code, ‘...in light of the potential rate and character of development activity and

the negative impacts of such development activity on the health, peace, safety, and general well-being of the residents and visitors of Aspen...”⁶ Highlights of this ordinance (City of Aspen 2006a) are below:

- To “address continued community growth concerns, a growth limit of one half of one percent (0.5 percent) has been implemented for free-market residential development.” The rate was reduced from 1 percent.
- The annual allotment of Free Market Residential units was reduced by more than half, and the number of units allowed in CC and C-1 zones was limited to six total units.
- The number of free-market residential units that may be created in a historic landmark commercial, lodge, or mixed-use development is limited.
- If property use is changed and in new mixed use projects, the number of affordable housing units required does change, and is required to be located at or above natural or finished grade.
- In an affordable housing development, 50 percent or more of each unit’s livable square footage must be located at or above natural or finished grade, whichever is higher. The deed restrictions for affordable units are further delineated by the *Affordable Housing Guidelines* established by the Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority⁷. The guidelines are amended annually to ensure the permanent affordability of the units (Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority, 2006).
- A provision for multi-growth allotments was added.
- Maximum residential sizes (2,000 square feet) was added to the Commercial Core, Commercial, Mixed-Use, and Neighborhood Commercial zone districts.

⁶ Ordinance No. 12 (Series of 2006) An emergency ordinance of the City Council of the City of Aspen, Colorado, approving amendments to Title 26—the Land Use Code of the City of Aspen Municipal Code, passed March 28, 2006 (City of Aspen 2006a).

⁷ Two new legislations were passed in 2001, which expanded the powers relating to housing authorities—House Bill 1172 and House Bill 1174.

Appendix C.

Transportation Plans and Studies Since 1997

Transportation issues continue to be very important to the communities along State Highway 82. Roaring Fork Transportation Authority has been very active in plan development, especially concerning Roaring Fork Valley commuters. The following plans and reports have been developed since the 1997 FEIS, and will influence transportation facility and service development in the study area. Although these studies and reports consider State Highway 82 and the entrance to Aspen, they would not change the impacts or intent of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative.

- *West Glenwood Springs to Aspen Corridor Investment Study*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority, May 2003—the study presents detailed analyses for a No Action/Committed Project Alternative, a Bus Rapid Transit Alternative, and a Rail Alternative for the West Glenwood Springs to Aspen transportation project. The Project corridor is located in the Roaring Fork Valley beginning at the West Glenwood I-70 interchange and ending in downtown Aspen (41.3 miles). It crosses Garfield, Eagle, and Pitkin Counties, and includes the Preferred Alternative from the Record of Decision for the 1997 Entrance to Aspen FEIS (RFTA 2003).
- *Intermountain 2030 Regional Transportation Plan*, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, 2004—CDOT has divided the state into 15 Transportation Planning Regions (TPR) based on geographic location, common transportation corridors, and socioeconomic similarities. Every five years, each TPR must update its Regional Transportation Plan to establish multi-modal transportation needs and priorities. The plan has a significant transit plan component. The resultant plans are then integrated into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In the 2030 Preferred Plan; the Maroon Creek Bridge Replacement is noted as the number one priority, bus rapid transit for the Roaring Fork Valley is priority number five, and the entrance to Aspen cut-and-cover tunnel is priority number 31. The draft FY2007–FY2009 STIP lists \$1.9 million for “Aspen State Highway 82” corridor investments (Felsburg 2004).
- *Local and Regional Travel Patterns Study*, April 2005—this study updates a similar study done in 1998. The report seeks to clarify relationships between travel behaviors and the geographic, economic and demographic characteristics of employees and households in the area; it analyzes opportunities for travel mode shifts and traffic reduction; and it provides forecasts of population and job growth. The information helps gauge progress toward local and regional transportation goals and informs future investments in transportation infrastructure. It has particular focus on commuting patterns among the towns and counties of the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys (RC Associates et al 2005).
- *Title VI Compliance Report*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA), September 2005—this report was developed to comply with Department of Justice and Department of Transportation regulations implementing Title VI regarding information on the manner in which federally funded services are provided. It reports system-wide service policies and standards used by RFTA that relate to service considerations covered by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 252, 42 U.S.C.

2000d-42 U.S.C. 2000d-4. This does not impact the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen projects (RFTA 2005b).

- *Area-wide Job Access Transportation Plan for the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys*, Roaring Fork Transportation Authority for Colorado Department of Transportation and Federal Transit Administration, May 2005—the purpose of this plan is to provide a framework for the development of projects to help address the transportation needs of low-income individuals in reaching their jobs in the Roaring Fork and Colorado River Valleys. The plan covers a six-year time period (2003–2008) and must be included in the Regional Transportation Plan for incorporation into the STIP process. This plan does not propose impacts to the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen projects (RFTA 2005a).

Appendix D Plans and Policies Since 1997

From FEIS 1997

The FEIS states that it and the proposed project comply with the following plans and policies:

- 1983 Goals Task Force Report
- *State Highway 82 Corridor Master Plan* (1985, Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office)
- Roaring Fork Transit Agency Development Program 1986–1990
- 1987 Aspen/Pitkin County Growth, Population and Housing Report
- *Down Valley Comprehensive Plan* (1987, Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office)
- High Occupancy Vehicle Facility Feasibility and Conceptual Design Study, 1988
- Colorado State Implementation Plan (IP) for Particulate Matter 10 Microns or Smaller in diameter (PM₁₀) Aspen Element (adopted November 1991 and revised September 1994)
- Aspen Area Community Plan (February 2, 1993)
- City of Aspen Transportation Implementation Plan
- City of Aspen: Parks, Recreation and Open Space Needs Assessment and Master Plan
- The Pitkin County Public Works Department: Mission, Goals, Road Management and Maintenance Objectives and Alternative Transportation Investment Objectives

Since 1997, additional plans and studies have been developed. They include the following:

- *Interim Aspen Area Citizen Housing Plan*, July 1998—this plan is Appendix B *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan*, of the intended to serve as a framework and guide to local officials, staff members and private property owner/developers in the identification, purchase and development of citizen housing sites. This plan does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Aspen/Pitkin 1998).
- *2000 Aspen Area Community Plan (AACP)*, February 2000—this plan updated the 1993 AACP and added four new themes to help address changes in the community since the original Plan: Capturing the Impacts of Growth and Change; Containing Development to Limit Sprawl; Economic Sustainability; and Arts, Culture and Education. By adopting the 2000 AACP, the City of Aspen and Pitkin jointly approved Aspen's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). This plan advocates infill and increased density, but does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Aspen/Pitkin 2000a).

-
- *Aspen Area Community Plan Action Plan 2000–2005*—this plan is Addendum A to the AACP. It outlines 99 Work Program Priorities for 2000–2005. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does support it (Aspen/Pitkin 2000b).
 - *City of Aspen Economic Benchmark Report* (Rural Planning Institute, 2001)—the report was compiled to aid in the larger process of analyzing changes taking place both in the local and regional economies of the Roaring Fork Valley. Its intended use was to begin a dialogue leading to a comprehensive understanding of the economic principles that shape Aspen and Pitkin County. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but supports its need (Rural Planning Institute 2001).
 - *Cemetery Lane Neighborhood Character Area Plan*, November 2001—this plan is a further refinement of the 2000 AACP and a blueprint for future action in the Cemetery Lane Neighborhood. The plan charts an approach to enhancing the character of the area in a way that residents and the City can follow. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (City of Aspen community Development Department 2001).
 - *Infill Program Report*, January 2002—this report is the work of the Infill Advisory Group established by the City Council in July 2000, to craft a strategy to restore a sense of vitality to the city’s neighborhoods. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does imply its need (City of Aspen Infill Advisory Committee 2002).
 - *Annexation Plan City of Aspen*, September 2005—the plan reflects the land use policy of the Aspen Area Community Plan with regard to adding urbanized land, and land appropriate for urbanization surrounding Aspen to the city’s jurisdiction. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (City of Aspen Community Development Department 2005b).
 - *Demographic Forecasts, An Interim Report 2005–2030*, Fall 2005—the Growth Scenarios Project grew out of the work of the Watershed Collaborative to better understand how the region will grow in coming decades. It was formed by local planning staff to review and update or revise the population forecasts for Eagle, Garfield, and Pitkin Counties and to consider the implications of the county forecasts for the sub-areas within the region. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative (Watershed Collaborative 2005).
 - *Draft Canary Action Plan*, City of Aspen Canary Initiative, 2006—in response to global climate change, and the City’s commitment to reduce this greenhouse gas emissions (government only) by 1 percent per year by joining the Chicago Climate Exchange, this plan identifies five primary components with specific greenhouse gas reduction targets and a sixth element—polity, research, and education—to enhance the success of the other five strategies. It does not affect implementation of the State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Preferred Alternative, but does support it by acknowledging the project’s goal of maintaining State Highway 82 traffic volumes at 1992 level, developing a TDM program, and proposed transit improvements (City of Aspen Community Development Department 2006c).

-
- *Local and Regional Travel Patterns Study*, April 2005—this study updates a similar study done in 1998. The information helps gauge progress toward local and regional transportation goals and inform future investments in transportation infrastructure (RC Associates et al 2005).
 - *2030 Intermountain Regional Transportation Plan*, 2004—CDOT has divided the state into 15 Transportation Planning Regions (TPR) based on geographic location, common transportation corridors, and socio-economic similarities (Felsburg 2004). Every five years, each TPR must update its Regional Transportation Plan to establish multi-modal transportation needs and priorities. The resultant plans are then integrated into the STIP (CDOT 2006a).

Plans underway

The Civic Master Plan, underway for the last five years, is nearing completion. It is a combination of long-range and current planning based on the guidance of the Aspen Area Community Plan, and the “8 Core Principles” adopted by the civic master Plan Advisory Group. More than a dozen specific sites have been examined to match appropriate uses with appropriate locations with the goal of improving the vitality of various neighborhoods within the “civic core.” Findings and recommendations were expected in December 2005 with a subsequent public process and City review (City of Aspen 2005a).